

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Bruce A. Beckman, #HCO3111542141, |) | C/A No. 4:15-cv-03410-RBH-KDW |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION |
| vs. |) | |
| |) | |
| Horry County Police Department; |) | |
| Detective Ryan Seipt, #4475, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

This is a civil action filed pro se by a local detainee. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e) (D.S.C.), this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in such pro se cases and to submit findings and recommendations to the District Court. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e); 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal).

I. Factual Background

Bruce A. Beckman (“Plaintiff”) is currently incarcerated at the J. Reuben Long Detention Center in Horry County, South Carolina. The online records of the Horry County Clerk of Court disclose that Plaintiff is awaiting trial on kidnapping, attempted-murder, armed-robbery, and grand-larceny charges. *See* <http://publicindex.sccourts.org/Horry/PublicIndex/PISearch.aspx> (last consulted Sept. 21, 2015). In the Complaint filed in this case, Plaintiff alleges that the investigating officer, Defendant Seipt, violated his due-process rights because Defendant Seipt conducted an inadequate and unfair investigation, fabricated and planted evidence, failed to give *Miranda* rights, and gave perjured testimony to obtain an arrest warrant and at a preliminary hearing and bond hearing. Compl. 1-12, ECF No. 1. Plaintiff also sues the “Horry County Police

Department,” but there are no specific allegations of wrongdoing by this Defendant. The only relief requested in the Complaint is “I seek my charges to be dismissed.” *Id.* at 4.

II. Standard of Review

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of Plaintiff’s pro se Complaint filed in this case. This review has been conducted pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996, and in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979).

Pro se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a pro se litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). When a federal court is evaluating a pro se complaint, the plaintiff’s allegations are assumed to be true. *De’Lonta v. Angelone*, 330 F.3d 630, 630 n.1 (4th Cir. 2003). Nevertheless, the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that this court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep’t of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, 391 (4th Cir. 1990). Even under this less stringent standard, the Complaint filed in this case is subject to summary dismissal under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

III. Discussion

As stated above, the only relief that Plaintiff requests this court to grant him from either Defendant is the dismissal of the pending state criminal charges. In order to grant such relief, this court would be required to improperly inject itself into the pending state criminal case, which it is precluded from doing under by the doctrine established by *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971) and its progeny. *Younger* and other cases hold that, absent extraordinary circumstances, federal courts are not authorized to interfere with a state's pending criminal proceedings. *See, e.g., Younger*, 401 U.S. at 44; *Nivens v. Gilchrist*, 319 F.3d 151, 154-55 (4th Cir. 2003); *Cinema Blue of Charlotte, Inc. v. Gilchrist*, 887 F.2d 49, 50-53 (4th Cir. 1989). Moreover, the Anti-Injunction Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2283, expressly prohibits this court from enjoining such proceedings. *Bonner v. Circuit Ct. of St. Louis*, 526 F.2d 1331, 1336 (8th Cir. 1975); *see also Gurley v. Superior Court of Mecklenburg County*, 411 F.2d 586, 587-88 (4th Cir. 1969) (federal courts may not issue writs of mandamus against state courts); *Craig v. Hey*, 624 F. Supp. 414 (S.D.W. Va. 1985) (same). For this court to grant the injunctive relief Plaintiff seeks: an order to the state court to dismiss the pending charges against Plaintiff, the court would be required to enjoin the state prosecution, and, as stated above, this is not something we can do under *Younger*, *Cinema Blue*, and *Bonner*. As a result, Plaintiff's allegations fail to state a plausible claim for relief against either Defendant.

Furthermore, the Complaint is frivolous and subject to summary dismissal to the extent that it names Horry County Police Department as a Defendant because Plaintiff includes no allegations of any wrongdoing against this Defendant. *See Potter v. Clark*, 497 F.2d 1206, 1207 (7th Cir. 1974) ("Where a complaint alleges no specific act or conduct on the part of the defendant and the complaint is silent as to the defendant except for his name appearing in the

caption, the complaint is properly dismissed.”); *Newkirk v. Circuit Court of City of Hampton*, No. 3:14CV372-HEH, 2014 WL 4072212 (E.D. Va. Aug. 14, 2014) (complaint subject to summary dismissal where no factual allegations against named defendants within the body of the pleading); *see also Krych v. Hvass*, 83 F. App’x 854, 855 (8th Cir. 2003); *Black v. Lane*, 22 F.3d 1395, 1401 n.8 (7th Cir. 1994); *Walker v. Hodge*, 4 F.3d 991, * 2 n. 2 (5th Cir. 1993); *Banks v. Scott*, 3:13CV363, 2014 WL 5430987, at *2 (E.D. Va. Oct. 24, 2014). In absence of substantive allegations of wrongdoing against the named Defendant, there is nothing from which this court can liberally construe any type of plausible cause of action arising from the Complaint against the police department. *See Cochran v. Morris*, 73 F.3d 1310 (4th Cir. 1996) (statute allowing dismissal of *in forma pauperis* claims encompasses complaints that are either legally or factually baseless); *Weller v. Dep’t of Social Servs.*, 901 F.2d at 389 n.2 (dismissal proper where there were no allegations to support claim).

Additionally, even if Plaintiff had included specific allegations against the police department, no plausible claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is stated against this Defendant because the department is not a “person” who may be liable under that statute for constitutional violations. A legal action under § 1983 allows “a party who has been deprived of a federal right under the color of state law to seek relief.” *City of Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes at Monterey, Ltd.*, 526 U.S. 687, 707 (1999). The civil rights statute 42 U.S.C. § 1983 “‘is not itself a source of substantive rights,’ but merely provides ‘a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.’” *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271 (1994) (quoting *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137, 144, n.3 (1979)). To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law.

West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988), *see Hall v. Quillen*, 631 F.2d 1154, 1155-56 (4th Cir. 1980). Plaintiff's naming of the department collectively is equivalent to use of the term "staff" or a similar collective term to name a defendant. It has been held that using such terms as a name for alleged defendants without the naming of specific staff members is not adequate to state a claim against a "person" as required in § 1983 actions. *See Barnes v. Baskerville Corr. Cen. Med. Staff*, No. 3:07CV195, 2008 WL 2564779 (E.D. Va. June 25, 2008).

IV. Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the Complaint in this case *without prejudice*. *See Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-04 (4th Cir. 1993); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal).

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.



September 23, 2015
Florence, South Carolina

Kaymani D. West
United States Magistrate Judge

**The parties are directed to note the important information in the attached
"Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation."**

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

**Robin L. Blume, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503**

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).